Central Intakes Meeting - 3/6/00

Steve Bradley Darryl Hayes Tom Cannon
Dave Briggs
Bruce Herbold
Dave Fullerton
Michelle Eng
Victor Pacheco

1. Calfed is taking another look at fish issues relating to Central Delta options - multiple intakes - Delta Wetland impacts. More emphasis is needed on fish issues then made in evaluating 2C and 3I. Concern as to how these issues will be addressed in EIR. Dangerous to put these new options into 2C and 3I which were already screened out. Concluded that we need to cover more of the Central Delta fish issues in the EIR, but not sure how we introduce them. How does the Central Delta storage fit into EIR?
2. This group is charged with technical issues relating to Central Delta intake options.
3. These issues could be addressed as part of 404 for ISDP - the ISDP already addresses improving SWP facility reliability, service to SDWA, and Delta ecosystem health. Problem is that ISDP team already tied up and not able to support CALFED EIS on these issues.
4. Basic Question: Is spreading intakes and moving north to Central Delta a good thing for fish? Such intakes may be constrained as much as present south Delta pumps. On a day-to-day basis there would be some benefits: areas of influence are smaller (no sumps) and there should be no need to salvage fish. On channel diversions are better where there are higher tidal velocities. Need to define how much pumping can be tolerated. Models would help get at this. Densities of fish may be higher in central Delta, but it would not be a sump and screens would protect. Operational rules would be developed for when fish are in the area of these new intakes.
5. Would Bacon or McDonald be better location for intakes? Storage at Bacon has advantage. Could connect McDonald to Bacon.
6. Would Bacon intake for Tracy eliminate SD water quality and water level problems? Some diversions from SD would make sure water quality is better, but water level problem would still require barriers.
7. What is "reliable" for SDWA? What level do they need is still a question. Sediment in channels may be key question because of shallow water habitat issues associated with dredging. Less dredging will be needed if less water is pumped from SD.
8. There is no SDP support to SDWA at this time.
9. Can we eliminate barrier conflict?
10. Would Bacon diversions be constrained in winter as at the SD pumps? Possibly not as much. What does flexibility of new intakes locations give us - both new storage and new pumping capacity? Central Delta may allow more pumping than at present in winter. How can we address these concerns and identify issues?
11. Would Hood Stage 1 report help focus our efforts? NO.
12. Will this alternative help with ISDP? ??
13. What about Stage 1A - could be satisfy SDWA with a McDonald diversion. Issues: directly address SD. Bacon option addresses environment. Separate issues.
14. Staging question with 1A - cost and tech feasibility questionable - both viable concerns in 404. Could implement with ISDP. No constraints on SDWA now - but there would be constraints on pumping from McDonald.
15. Bacon is a good investment - McDonald 1A is less certain. McDonald 1A might only meet one-half of needs of SDWA and doesn't do much for water levels.
16. Fatal flaw in 1A - moving SDWA intakes from benign southeast area to central areas of concern - even with screens - larval fish entrainment problem.
17. Bacon would help with SDWA problem by moving Tracy intake north. But water quality relatively unaffected. Need to decide how big Bacon intakes would be. If making it bigger to help SDWA, it may be better. Most of our objectives can be met with Bacon. May still need barriers and barriers may be a cheaper option. Could get by with fewer barriers with Bacon.
18. While Tracy pumping affects water level, ag pumping does not.
19. Woodward and Victoria options? Siphons are very expensive.
20. Can we stage Bacon 1b/1d? Yes.
21. Present status of ISDP: problem with siphon under Italian SL. No direction on staging program. JPOD? Barriers not ok as yet. No preferred alt.
22. Water Quality Issues: covered by existing studies. Water quality looking at various locations (Old River pipeline, SBA, CCF, Old River Intake. We can analyze these data, which would help us look at 1A. This needs to be put together. There are some local differences in WQ for the new locations. WQ overall does not change much overall by shifting intakes. CALFED did not look at this for WQ, but did for Hood and isolated facility. Nothing done on WQ for what we are talking about, although MWD and CCWD have done crude analyses of WQ from Central Delta intakes. Not much change in WQ without Hood diversion.

Conclusions

- Bacon option gives more flexibility and yield.
- Late fall and early winter when barriers can't be operated Bacon helps.
- Indirect benefits of Bacon to SDWA, but still need to look at barriers and off-line distribution system.
- Connection to Bacon needed to help water levels to get this benefit.
- Bacon is more consistent with present CALFED alternative than McDonald alternative.
- DEFT and fish screen team need to evaluate these options.